Dear Fred and Marlynn,

June 17, 1969

In the letter I wrote you yesterday I made mention of one of Lifton's many claims against Harold, which you have indicated acceptance of, concerning the Receda debate cancellation, and indicated that I had finally gotten to examine the actual documents (letters) and compare them with Dave's description and attendant claims that Harold was lying. My conclusion, and that of someone unconnected with this who volunteered to read the stuff and render a judgment as an impartial party, knowing little of the protagonists, heartily agreed with me: Unlike Dave, I do not easily throw around the term liar, although here it would seem to be justified. Earlier I challenged some of Dave's comments on other items of which I had some knowledge, and refused his comments and theories about the color changes and Powell thing. After doing this, however, I did not follow his suit and rhetorically (or perhaps literally) ask how you could associate with a person who would say and do such things. Furthermore, for the second time I made myself a promise not to keep engaging in this dialogue which was consuming enormous amounts of my time to no avail, since if I made a point, there was little change in attitude at the receiving end. The first time I so restricted myself, I went back on it because of Dave's false charges about the color changes and the Powell thing. This time I go back because by putting questions to Harold as suggested by Dave, I have caused Harold to waste much valuble time and money sending me copies of much of his correspondence, which took a fair amount of digging to get to, with those individuals who Dave cited. Harold having made this kind of a sacrifice in defending himself against both old and new charges prompted me to write you once more on this subject, because what Harold sent me, in terms of his letters, and letters to him from those who Dave cites on the West Coast, have overwhelmingly backed up Harold's descriptions of the incidents or people's relationships with him (as he was led to believe them, assuming no double dealing, duplicity, back-stabbing, or lemming-like character) and evaluations of his work and appearences on the West Coast. I had previously heard the same descriptions from both Harold and Lillian, and as you may know, she is fairly independent and not infrequently disagrees with him on some things, and felt I had little reason to doubt them, but had not seen much of this correspondence. Harold has offered he his entire files, as he did last summer, this summer, but what he has sent is far more than enough. These things are in black and white and no infemences or theories are needed to interpret what is so clearly spelled out.

In answer to Dave's charges, allegedly quoted from others, I quote from Harold's last letter to me, having already examined the correspondence to which he refers, and not having time to construct an elaborate essay myself—but, some comments by me will follow: (note: I have heard some of this from Mal Verb, independent of Harold)

"Publication date of WW II was 12/2/66. I delayed public use of it until 12/7, on the Jack McKinney show, but had expected to use some of its content on a confrontation between me alone of the critics and not fewer than four of the Commission lawyers in a "Majority Report" Metromedia show. We were to have gotten together in their offices the night of 12/5, and I alone showed up, having a long meeting with Mel Baily, Paul Noble, and a vice-president-in-charge of something. We then worked out a new formula, me against Nizer and whoever of the Commission lawyers would appear with him as champion, but at least one, as a symbol. He had me tossed off after what I did to him on WOR."...After the 12/7 McKinney show, beginning 2 AM, I drove home, worked that day and next getting ready for the trip, left early morning of the 10th for Chicago, Madison, Chicago, Milwaukee, thence to SF, using the trip for stopoffs. Liebeler was supposed to have met me in NY, Chi., SF and LA. He didn't show in NY, had the message in Chi he should read my second book before he met me (WBB airmailed one immediately). In SF he sent a tape instead. Mal was in the studio and knows I tore it apart in minutes. I turned down the Lamax show, as Bill and all the others know, in order to face Liebler on it. Some of those characters must have a copy of it (I do not) and this is clear in the very first words. Those intellectuals and personal opponents have no concept of the dramatic, and there was a dramatic impact I think most viewers will remember, when he asked me "what difference does it make" and I gave him proper response, got up, walked out and

ook the sympathies and the applause of the audience with me. Now, with all those copies of WWII to send out, I left this to Lil, and she tore her hand terribly, wore out all the gloves she had, etc. I was off when it served no purpose to sell the book because it was not on sale, simply to keep this promise to Bill and Maggie. They both called me together, in October or November, and begged me to go there (never offering to pay the cost), and I kept writing them things to do, challenges to issue for me until I got there, etc. If nothing else, the timing shows this trip could not have been for anything in my interest for it was against it, with the book to get out so it could be sold. That was very costly. Hal had asked me to go to SF, after the experience I what I accomplished on one Dolan Show by phone and unprepared (and I have Dolan's letter saying that he never had such a guest or show), and he said the CCI would pay the expenses. When I got there I learned it was not the CCI before which I was to speak but the Militant Forum, and I did, with Keating ahead of me. Before, after, and since the meeting I took some pretty tough baiting for that, but I kept my word. And to date, of fare alone, I doubt if I have gotten a third of it back, no fee, etc. Hal knew I was using that for the purpose of taking after Liebler for the LA people. It is in the letters, all discussed in terms of costs that would have to be met. Incidentally, that was the most successful Forum meeting ever. They charged an admission, sold book but I got not a cent toward my expenses, then or since."

On Lillian's claim, according to Dave, about the maps: "Totally false, if she said it, and I have the files to show you. What I sent her was the Dealy Plaza utilities Blueprints, before and after construction of the plaza. Al Chapman got them for me. She never acknowledged receipt, never answered my request that she let me know she got them, and a long time later, perhaps not in response for the first request for them, finally returned them." [I will say more on this.]

"On Maggie and my stealing what she had in her book: I have never seen it nor asked to see it, but I did, in writing, offer my help in getting it published, offering the art work, etc...all before I met her. Rather is the contrary true, for again before I had ever met any of them I sent her a copy of the ms of WW II for her and Bill to read for such knowledge as it could give them and for such suggestions as they could give me. They took much longer than we had and they were supposed to, made no suggestions, merely praised it/me or both. I have the letters. [I have seen them. GRS] Now, this was my second book. I took Post Mortem and the documents to O in NO out there on my next rip and gave them to her to copy. She didn't even bother. I forgot to give Paul PM, but he will confirm that he got the appendix to O in NO. [Which, although Harold doesn't know, he did to me long ago.GRS] You tell me what I was going to get from her book. I left the 26 volumes before the others were through them. What else did she have access to? I turned witnesses over to them, etc., and have the tapes to prove that. That is really outrageous, if she did say it. [Notice Harold's continued emphasis on this. GRS] You can see my written offers to work for her/them free at the Archives, my sending her what I knew she could use in her book, etc and in the entire file you will find not one such thing from her. [I guess unknown to Harold, when I spent much time with him last summer, I saw at least a few of these letters, when he gave me acess to all his files for other reasons. I never mentioned it because it had little meaning, and the only reason I looked at some correspondence files was out of curiosity, since I have often though of the idea of writing a history of the critics. GRS] Bear in mind she had the ms of WW II and, if she had anything that could help, and she knew this was being published, she could have offered." "On Ray, who is more ill-mannered and insulting than you can imagine, I met him, drove him around Washington, took him to my place, got him a place to stay, took him there, took him to DC next day, etc., took him to Sam to try and get him to make his projected monographattractiv etc. It is merely what we all do for each other, what many have done for me. But far from wanting or using what he had, I had what he didn't, his stuff was then old, and I can show you in writing my suggestions and offers to improve his thing." [Note, Harold, however, considers Ray quite brilliant and capable, and had written and said so often, including in this letter. GRS]

"Lifton: Knowing he would, I taped that phone conversation. Only because Paul (possible Hal also) encouraged me to,did I call him. He was puerile in the futility and immaturity of his pumping efforts, and I call him on them and told him if he didn't stop I'd hang up. I told him that with the threats that were coming back to me of his and KT's plans to sue me, I'd be foolis to tell him what I had learned of KT, what had interested me. I told him I had neither knowledge or interest in the perjury charge. [And due to Dave's misrepresentation, I have wasted time continually telling him this, which apparently, Harold already has. I have seen what Harold has an know why he is interested in KT, and consider that interest warranted. GRS] "It boiled down to his taking Thornley's word because he believed him an honorable man. I then challanged him to check out a few points where he could decide for himself whether or not KT was honest." Harold then goes on to note Liebler's silence.

"On Maggie and Bill again, they even sent me copies of Liebeler tapes for me to tear apart and with them pointed out how he had Lane (hence all of them) on the ropes. He did have Lane, too, for foolish Lane had promised to sue Liebeler for calling him and liar and was forever promising the papers would soon be filed. [Unknown to Harold, I have independent knowledge of this. In addition, when I first was commissioned to write for the Mlps. Star-Tribune, one of their top reporters discarded Lane and the critics, because Lane had been called a liar, and it was well known to journalists, and Lane had not done any suing, and this has even been pointed out in letters to the editor attacking Lane. In fact, when I arranged for Lane to come here, one of the first questions he had to answer was about Liebeler having called him a liar, and that was in the Spring, in fact the late Spring, of 1967! He answered that he would sue Liebeler for what he valued his opinion at--about 5¢. It was a typical Lane answer, said with conviction, and worked well, but it was a lie.] And: "But on this question of allegedly intending to steal from them, what was to steal if I had the intent? Remember, I had finished the fourth book and had written parts of others by 5/67, had finished O in NO end March or first April 67, had done WW II before Lane's appeared. All of my work that is now printed was printed well before Sylvia's or Tink's were even done. I was dredging the Archives beginning, I think, in April 66. I got stuff then I still haven't used. [This I can personally vouch for. You can go into Harold's files and find documents and memos he did which he doesn't remember at first, or only remembers after having seen them. No one, and I repeat no one, known to me, is capable of assimilating and absorbing, and remembering even a portion of what he has uncovered and I have seen in his home. GRS]

Now, for some of my own notes upon glancing through this correspondence of which Harold sent me copies. Note, first however, that Harold did this reluctantly, and only after Lifton insisted that I not believe a word he said and ask him pointed questions. So, against my best thoughts, I did just this. The result: I find Harold 100% truthful, not even exaggerating, and others not so. Ironically, I had expected to find some exaggeration on Harold's part, as is common of all of us, but didn't encounter it. Here are some exerpts:

Lifton: Harold's letter to him of May 7 indicates the futility of Dave's ceaseless charges and claims, and how they hurt those investigating, and complains about the unjustness of charges made against Maggie and others. Dave's letter of July 6, 1967:

"Dear Harold, Enclosed find $5. I can hardly wait to get your new book, on the photographic whitewash, so please send it as soon as possible. I'm on pins and needles. Bill O'Connell was reading me excerpts on the phone. It is really amazing to go from photographic famine to photographic plenty. I have never heard of most of these cameras! Dick Sprague tells me that the Bond slides are of top quality. I have been going through Whitewash II and creating a small card file so that when I finally get to the archives, I will at least have the familiarity that comes with knowing the file #'s and documents you have covered already. I recently wrote to Itek and they seem amenable to the analysis of other films and other hypothesis. I think that some terrifi work can be done by combining the Bond series and the Willis series. Whether or not you agree or disagree with the camouflage hypothesis that I have put forward, one thing is certain: between Willis 6 and 7 and the Bond slides, high quality color film now exists which can be used to prove or disprove it. Will be looking forward to receiving you new book. Regards, David."

So here is a reply to all that I have had to listen to from Dave about Harold's work, in Dave's own letter to Harold!

From Lillian's correspondence: Two days after Harold got home, with his wife sick, he honored her request and sent her what she asked for: plans that she did not have. In her letter to him of 7/24/68, handwritten, she apologized for the delay in her acknowledgement of receipt of the things which he sent (his first letter is 2/19/68, second on this subject, 6/19/68--she delayed over 5 months in acknowledging). She wrote: "Thank you for the plans--I had them in the batch of small films sent to me by West which I had given to Steve Jaffe and asked him to have larger copies made but which he never had done--so, I used your larger copies and had copies made for me, Ray, Maggie and Fred Newcomb." So she did use Harolds, and you were even a beneficiary. In the PS we find: "PS. I heard from Cutler asking to use my proof that 7202=Willis 5--I told him Okay but didn't tell him that no one will ever publish it--no one ever has." This is incredible. It is long after the date of publication of WW II (say about a year for a starter and here is Lillian saying that no one has ever used her proof, long after she read WW II. So she has no reason to say that Harold did, since she has already said in print, that no one has. Furthermore, this backs up Harold's story, which is checked in his book, that he used a different proof. Harold, again, is 100% right, according to what Lillian herself wrote in no uncertain terms. Whether she really said what Dave alleges, of course, I cannot know.

but the Reasons you said that she told you she didn't want Harold using her research are clearly without basis whatsoever. Given her laments about no one using her work, her current version, if it is being correctly expressed to me, is frankly unbelievable. Lillian's letter of 7/2/66: Incredibly complimentary towards WW I. She sends, enclosed, her manuscript and mentions the others to whom she has sent it. Then: "I begged and pleaded with him to use it with his name on it--that I wasn't interested in recognition or payment--I just wanted the information presented to the people." She didn't want her name on it when they insisted she write it, and said to "leave it anonymous or use the name Elizabeth Stoneborough for my relative's sake." She also notes the Ramparts let it sit on their desk, Fox, Cook, Epstein, and Newsweek did not acknowledge with even a word. Then: "If you can do anything with it--feel free. I don't want my name used or any money," after having lamented over the fact that nobody would publish it. So, she even gave permission, and even requested, anonymous use, so Harold would have had a right to do this, although he did not. She expressed fear: "I'm afraid of it myself." "At any rate--use it if you can in any way you want. Just don't use my name. Maybe it's too dangerous." "If I can help you in any way please ask me. We all owe you a tremendous debt of gratitude for your book. Thank you again for writing it." and so on, ad infinitem. Well Fred and Marlynn, times have changed She gave Harold carte blanche, with not only no credit requested, but almost an admonition not to use her name, and asked one publication not to use it point blank, and then you tell me that she says that Harold stole her stuff? And she denies even that in writing. And I have all of this in front of me, in her handwriting!

Bill O'Connell: Bill's letter to Harold of Jan.9, 1966, contains a dispassionate analysis of the Lomax show which corresponds to what Harold has told me, and conflicts directly with what you people described. ie: "I think, too, everyone felt you were a model of poise, control, and forebearence until the penultimate moment. You made your case with a minimum of histrionics and a maximum of good sense, logic, and persuasiveness. Lomax, on the other hand, came off very badly"..."But it was not a fruitful exchange due to the basic condition: a moderator predisposed to an untenable position which he sought to advance in a way that was personally crude, unattractive and dishonest. So we had what might be called a negative victory here. My father criticised me for putting you on that show, but I countered with the argument that it was on this show that we had to make some kind of rebuttal to Liebler. I think all the other appearances speak for themselves and for the most part were consistently effective. I missed hearing the two interviews that I did with you, but the personel at the station were most impressed." Etc, etc.,etc.§ O'Connell's letter of 9/22/66: contains much negative and derogatory stuff about Lifton, and then: on Lane: [after the Holt man had said that Lane's was the only book] "I demurred and brought up Whitewash (also in the taping) but they were so intoxicated with their success that it mattered little. Lane went on and on and I'm going to have to edit the tape severely. He started reading correspondence between Liebler and Rankin on the missing road signs. These letters are given him by Lifton. I was so taken aback that I didn't have the presence of mind to ask him how these had come into his possession. Earlier in the day he had an abortive confrontation with Liebler at the universities Student Union. Liebler challenged him to a debate and it may be set up, but I think it rather unlikely. Lane will sign autographs at Pickwick Monday night according to the paper this morning and leaves then on Tuesday for San Francisco. There were a number of tactical errors Lane made at the press conference and Liebler wants to answer them. And, get this, David Lifton is helping Liebler prepare his rebuttal to Lane's contentions! I think that this is absolutely shocking. Dave has turned into another Jones Harris. He is beyond redemption in my book and I think you must be very guarded if you continue to write to him. He misrepresented you at Maggie's party on at least one occassion. Bill's letter of July 20, 1967, was complimentary also; and said in addition: "Sylvia phoned me yesterday about another matter and had some very warm and cordial things to say not only abou your book, but about you as a person." §Note the date--long after she had split from Garrison§ So, if Lifton's O'Connell's quotes are correct, I would challenge them too, although at least in this case, unlike with Lillian, it is possible that there is some misunderstanding in terms of what Harold meant by his descriptions and what Bill interprets. Again, I have it in writing.

Maggie: July 11, 1966: She describes WW I as "extraordinarily important" and says that it should be "getting the major attention." and "For your courage and penetrating exposure, we 'researchers" will be forever in your debt--and so should the nation be!" [It is interesting how such "debts" are acknowledged these days.] July 6, 1966: "Again my grateful felicitations on 'Whitewash'! It's the book which needed to be written--and I only wish everyone in the U.S. (and abroad) could have a copy..." [Sylvia once said that if it were a choice between her book and Harold's, she would want WW published.] April 9, 1967: very warm letter, with thanks, and kind comments for his work, and then: "There is no question in my mind that the work you have

done on the case, in every facet, is of the highest calibre and deserves the richest possible praise and recognition and one day this nation may well be made aware of its debt to you." Then: "As fo r your question about Liebeler, as far as I know, he has been silent but I have heard rumors that he plans to run for Congress--are you ready for that??" And: "Incidentally, Harold, may I use the memorandum you sent me from the archives in my published work and if so how shall it be designated? I see no references for it." And then there was much thanks for things Harold had sent her. Then, in a letter of Aug. 1, 1967, after thanking Harold again for things he sent, she wrote: "I would like to use the documents concerning the car and the windshield if it is all right with you do so. Also, do you want me to return the documents or you or not?"

So Fred and Marlynn, from the correspondence, in their own handwriting or on their own typewriters from the people you and Dave quote, to Harold, which I have in my hands and have read, and which I have quoted from in very brief terms in this letter, I would conclude that the charges made against Harold, the claims made about him, are totally baseless. The ones you quoted from Lillian are outlandishly false in every respect: he did not steal the work she claimed, and she admitted it or at best, stated it explicitly, and anyway, she begged him to use it and didn't want her name used or any credit. The Rancho thing is as Harold described it. The comments of Bill O'Connell as quoted by Lifton cannot be taken seriously, if the quoting is correct. The alleged "mouchers holiday" which Dave claims that Maggie was worried about, is not only patently absurd for the reasons both Harold and I have outlined in terms of who could have mouched from whom, but contradicted by the relationship she expresses in her correspondence, all he sent her including his manuscripts, the early date of completion and publication of his manuscripts, and the other things noted in letters from both her and Bill O'Connell. And even Lifton's correspondence with Harold is antithetical to what he now claims his opinions of Harold's work (as compared with his) are today, and I take Dave at his word since he prides himself on being so straighforward and wedded to the truth.

I already suspect that I should have taken Harold's advice, when I got this stuff from him, and simply forgotten the whole thing and not taken up any sort of defense of him, since he doesn't care at this point anyway. It has, as he predicted, cost much in time, anxiety, and mailing costs for both of us. It has made it far more difficult to deal with you two and Dave. And it has ended as Harold predicted: with me in possession of convincing info backing his story, with me having picked apart many of Dave's arguments without even needing backup info, and with really little recognition of the falseness of the charges made about Harold by you people.

In my last letter I nailed down the charges that Harold was stealing from you, or thinking of it, one by one, and showed that quite the opposite is true, and that with the possible exception of me, no one but Harold has really put himself out to get you credit for what you have done. And, ironically, Harold, long after you flaggelated him in letters, continued to do so and in fact, has spent more time, more energy, etc. in doing this than even I. To boot, he has cited you in Coup D'Etat, bringing it in out of context (as in page 80 which I sent) and also been very complimentary in other parts, just to make a record of it. And then you defend Lane, who participated in the single greatest theft of your work and in fact, was the main mover behind it, and say that he cites people, when he is in fact acknowledged by many critics as a man who poses as a loner and cites no one. And he defends continuallly theft, and has done so twice with me. And then it is Harold who fights it out with him on this issue, over the theft of your work specifically, on a TV show, and Lane defends his theft of your work and Harold attacks it, and you call Harold the theif! Is there no justice left out there? Well, I would think that there has come the time for some serious thought. I will brook no more charges against Harold or myself. It is tiresome to go day after day refuting them or finding them to be false, or charitably grossly overstated to an almost incredible degree. Whether you or Dave rely on sources which distort, or the distortions and theories are your own, and whether they come from you two or from Dave, matters little. Repeating gossip and grapevine stuff, something you yourselves have been the victim of more times than you know, and against which I have strained long standing friendships to defend you against many times, in word and writing, is little better than making it up yourself, unless one believes in a double-standard. When I think of the work I could have done in this time, and that the net result is to find Harold 100% in the right and guilty of not even exaggeration of note, and no purpose having been served, I am disgusted. I trust that you will think seriously about these things. As ever--

Jim